<u>REMARKS</u>

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-50 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 30-35, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and 50 have been amended. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance.

Amendments

The amendments to the claims help clarify that a human readable resource designator and a computer readable resource designator are formed on a readable resource and that the computer readable resource can be used by a computer to automatically access the readable resource. Moreover, the computer readable resource designator includes a means for confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource so that it will not be confused with other computer readable resources designators that might be formed on the readable resource.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,733 to Wilz, et al. (hereinafter "Wilz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,933 to Durst (hereinafter "Durst").

Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended recites a method comprising [portions of the amended language appear in bold below]:

- providing a readable resource;
- defining a human-readable resource designator associated with the readable resource;
- defining a computer-readable resource designator **associated with the human-readable resource designator** and that can be used by a computer to automatically access the readable resource; and
- **forming,** on the readable resource, the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator, the computer-readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource helping to prevent said computer-readable resource designator from being confused with

other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource.

In short, Claim 1 requires forming a computer readable resource designator on a readable resource where the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the readable resource. As relied upon by the Examiner, Wilz, Fig. 1A, illustrates a document in the form of a Web-site Directory (13) showing several URL encoded bar codes (8), human readable URLs (14), and content descriptions corresponding to each URL. In other words, each bar code (8) can be scanned to access a web page described by the content description for that web page. The directory (13) does not include a bar code that can be scanned to access the directory (13) itself.

Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest forming a computer readable resource designator on a readable resource where that designator can be used to access the readable resource. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 1 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 2-8, 41, and 42 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 9 has been amended and, as amended recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to [portions of the amended language appear in bold below]:

- define a human-readable resource designator comprising a URL that can be used to access a Web page;

- define a computer-readable resource designator associated with and corresponding to the URL that can be used by a computer to automatically access said Web page; and

- **form** the human-readable resource designator with the computer-readable resource designator in a manner such that **when** the Web page is printed,

the human-readable and computer readable designators appear thereon wherein the computer-readable resource designator comprises means for a computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access **the Web page** helping to prevent said computer-readable resource designator from being confused with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the **Web page.**

In short, Claim 9 requires instruction for forming a computer readable resource designator on a printed Web page where the computer readable resource designator can be used to access the Web page. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest forming a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator can be used to access the web page. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 9 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 10-13, 43, and 44 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 9 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 9, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 14 has been amended and, as amended recites a method [portions of the amended language appear in bold below] comprising:

- reading, with a computer, a computer-readable resource designator displayed on a readable resource and displayed in conjunction with a human-readable resource designator that can be read by a human and used to access the readable resource;

- **confirming that the computer readable resource can be used to automatically access the readable resource helping to prevent said computer-readable resource designator from being confused with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource;**

- processing the computer-readable resource designator to identify a network-accessible resource;

- requesting the readable resource **from the network-accessible resource;** and

- receiving the **readable resource**.

In short, Claim 14 requires reading a computer readable designator displayed on a readable resource, confirming that the designator can be used to access the readable resource, requesting and receiving the readable resource. Neither Wilz not Durst discloses nor suggests a method in which a computer-readable resource designator is read where that designator is displayed on a readable resource and later processed to request and ultimately receive the readable resource. Moreover, neither Wilz nor Durst teach or suggest confirming that the computer readable resource designator can be used to automatically access the readable resource. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 14 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 15-19, 45, and 46 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 14 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 14, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 20 has been amended and, as amended recites a system [portions of the amended language appear in bold below] comprising:

- a readable resource;
- a human-readable resource designator on the readable resource, **said human readable resource designator being associated with the readable resource;** and
- a computer-readable resource designator on the readable resource, said computer-readable resource designator being useable to access the **readable resource;**
- the computer-readable resource designator being associated with and corresponding to the human-readable resource designator;
- the computer-readable resource designator being configured for use by a computer so that a computer can automatically retrieve **the readable resource** and the computer readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve **the readable** resource helping to prevent said computer-

readable resource designator from being confused with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource that can be used by the computer to access other resources not associated with both the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator.

In short, Claim 20 requires a computer readable resource designator on a readable resource where the designator can be used by a computer to access the readable resource. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator can be used to access the readable resource. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 20 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 21-29, 47, and 48 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 20 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 20, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 30 has been amended and, as amended recites a system [portions of the amended language appear in bold below] comprising:

- a human-readable resource designator **formed on a readable resource and associated with the readable resource;** and

- a computer-readable resource designator **formed on the readable resource and** associated with and corresponding to said human-readable resource designator, the computer-readable resource designator being configured for use by a computer so that a computer can automatically retrieve **the readable resource,** said computer-readable resource designator comprising means for the computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to access said **readable resource** helping to prevent said computer-readable resource designator from being confused with other computer-readable resource designators that **may be formed on the readable resource.**

Similar to the other claims above, Claim 30 requires a computer readable resource designator formed on a readable resource where the designator can be used to automatically access the readable resource. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator can be used to access that readable resource. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 30 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 31-34 depend directly claim 30 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 30, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 35 has been amended and, as amended recites a system [portions of the amended language appear in bold below] comprising:

- a readable resource **on which** a human-readable resource designator and a computer-readable resource designator associated with and corresponding to the human-readable resource designator **have been formed;**

- the computer-readable resource designator being configured for use by a computer so that a computer can automatically retrieve **the readable resource,** the computer readable resource designator comprising means for ~~the~~ a computer to confirm that the computer readable resource designator can be used to retrieve **the readable** resource helping to prevent said computer-readable resource designator from being confused with other computer-readable resource designators that might appear on the readable resource;

- a server configured to receive requests **from the computer for an electronic version of the readable** resource associated with both the human-readable resource designator and the computer-readable resource designator, and return **the readable resource to the computer; and**

- a data store for holding **the electronic version of the readable resource that can be requested by the computer.**

Similar to the other claims above, Claim 35 requires a readable resource on which a computer readable resource designator has been formed where the computer readable resource designator can be used by a computer to automatically retrieve an electronic version of the readable resource. As made clear above, Wilz both alone and in combination with Durst fails to teach or suggest a computer readable resource designator on a web page or any other readable resource where that designator can be used to access that readable resource. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, a prima facie case for obviousness has not been established, and Claim 35 distinguishes over Wilz in view of Durst.

Claims 36-40, 49 and 50 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 35 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 35, are neither shown nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-50 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Guy L. Burnham

By _____

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

January 10, 2005